

Review of IBI WSP Technical memo dated Apr 26, 2017. RT North Corridor section only.

The IBI Technical memo is a fear mongering document to convince councillors that there is no alternative to building a tunnel. There is no imagination in this document authored by non-London experts. This document confirms that they are designing a rail system. That's why the tunnel is so long and that's why roadway must be increased on Wharncliffe Road for the same number of lanes of traffic.

For example the demolition of many historical homes on Wharncliffe is not true. It's to scare our City Councillors into making a shifty decision. The report shows that there are 96 heritage homes on Wharncliffe between Riverside and Oxford St. of which 24 must be demolished.

There are 96 homes on this street. Four are listed in the London Heritage Data base as priority 1 and 2 houses and they are well back of any street widening. They only became designated (after another IBI report) in 2014 or 2015 as part of Heritage Area. Before 2014 **not one was a designated Heritage home** in the City of London Heritage Database. In fact the document referenced by Shift still reflects that none have historical significance.



I show a picture of one of these Heritage homes, so you can see the replacement picture posted on it. The replacement picture is not a heritage modification and is not in keeping with any Heritage principals. Be consistent and do not apply Heritage Designation as an excuse, since it's being ignored here.

No one wants to destroy these homes. None should be destroyed to allow a dedicated bus lane. When you think of it, a dedicated lane in other cities, usually means a lot of paint for one of the existing lanes. But Shift wants to inconvenience everyone in London. IBI Group is competent at RT but gives minimal consideration to London's overall transportation and housing needs.

London BRT has turned back into a LRT Design.

Wharncliffe is widened to accommodate trains. The width of the 2 proposed car lanes is 6.6 meters. The width of the 2 BRT lanes is now more than 7.6 meters. The narrower car lanes also handle local buses, delivery trucks and even garbage trucks and other LTC vehicles. Yet the BRT lanes now require lanes that are wider than those used by all other LTC buses? Only trains require this width.

The technical memo requires the demolition of many Wharncliffe homes around Blackfriars and Barrington Ave. The real reason (other than above) is that they have added traffic lights and 3 lanes of car traffic at these two intersections. These traffic lights and extra lanes do not exist today – just a crosswalk at Blackfriars. If you remove the lights and extra lanes of cars you do not have to widen the road and destroy houses. There is still a place to make U-turns at Mt Pleasant for example.

Have you looked at the station design? It's a block long between Riverside and Kensington Ave. Buses don't need this amount of space, only trains do. Stop the train design.

Let's try a made-in-London based system that does not destroy property. We all know the tunnel will destroy Richmond Row. Ask any business located there. 99% do not want the tunnel. We paid IBI a lot of money for this scare document. The Wharncliffe alternative was made to look ridiculous because of their train focus.

There is a compromise used by many cities when you don't want to widen streets or bridges. For example, it was used on the Golden Gate Bridge to handle the influx of cars to San Francisco during the morning and requires a change of flow in a couple of lanes at midday.

Just have ONE dedicated BRT lane in the middle of Wharncliffe Rd and have traffic go one way in the morning (to Western) and the other way in the afternoon. The other BRT buses can be mixed with cars as in the original Shift report for Wharncliffe Road. Since the only drivers in the dedicated BRT lane are professionals and only 20 vehicles will use it per hour, it should be easy to coordinate the midday switch over. Then there is no need to widen Wharncliffe Road unless we want to add a dedicated bike lane.

The Shift people really want rail transit. They have because they incorrectly thought London wanted a train solution. We voted against it a year ago.

In May 2016 Council passed a motion for BRT with the following (bold is added):

- c) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to design the Full Bus Rapid Transit Network Alternative taking into consideration a **future** transition to a Light Rail Transit technology and utility infrastructure lifecycle renewal requirements;

So it looks like we are designing a Light Rail System. Ten minutes later a motion made by M van Holst and H Usher changed it to be more reasonable. It passed in a 10-3 vote.

- c) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to design the Full Bus Rapid Transit Network Alternative taking into **consideration a potential transition** to a Light Rail Transit technology and utility infrastructure lifecycle renewal requirements;

Considering Potential transition means a rail design is not really required in all areas at all times. Council does NOT require a Rail tunnel on Richmond Street. Western will NOT accept a Rail System. This also means that Wharncliffe Rd does NOT require widening the road for two trains to go down the middle of the street. Unlike Shift, let's think BUS not train.

This is the most citizen unfriendly proposal I have ever seen. It's the only proposal to spend a lot of money to cause more vehicle bottlenecks on major roads without enhancing public transportation.

Shift has stated that London (pop 384,000) is the biggest city in Canada without Rapid Transit? This is false. Other than in Capital cities, few RT systems are used in other cities in Canada

No Rapid Transit exists in: Laval (pop 423,000), Hamilton (537,000), Surrey BC (518,000)

The Ottawa LRT is 1 year behind schedule due to a tunnel collapse. Here's what the Ottawa tunnel looks like when visited by our Premier.



Our proposed 24 km route is also longer than many large cities

Ottawa (934,000) is 12.5km, Proposed Hamilton RT is 13.4km and requires demolition of 200 homes.

Kitchener/Waterloo (338,000) is 19km and is being built for 4 years and not in use yet and does not involve digging tunnels.

Most RT's are built on railroad or unused property right of ways. Ours is planned to be in the middle of our major roads. Our design is bad. None of the other RT's try to cause bottlenecks with existing car traffic like London's BRT will do.

Shift Business Case reports (2015,2016,2017) all ignores their own requirement for the Adelaide Underpass as a prerequisite before BRT is to be implemented. Adelaide Underpass is still not funded and scheduled for 2025 at the earliest.

Richmond Tunnel Fun Facts:

Longest non-rail tunnel to be built in Ontario.

It's longer than the Ontario portion of the Windsor-Detroit tunnel. It's longer than the tunnel under the Welland Canal. These tunnels can handle 35,000 vehicles per day.

Only 480 Vehicles per day will use the Richmond bus only tunnel. At peak hour there will be only 30 vehicles using the tunnel. Richmond Street now handles 30,000 vehicles per day.

Shift estimates that Richmond Street will be continuously under construction for 3 years because they are really building a rail tunnel. This will ruin a majority of businesses on Richmond Row. To survive many businesses will relocate to car-friendly malls.

When construction is finished there will be no tunnel stops for almost 1km between north of Oxford St and the Victoria Park Bandshell. This ensures that Richmond Row business will continue to be bypassed in the future.

Over 40% of the ridership of all buses are students. Most of the riders on the Richmond route are students.

It will take longer for a student at the Ceeps returning to Campus with BRT than the current system. Main reason is the walk over the CP tracks to the underground BRT terminal just north of Oxford St. Today they just catch a local bus near Jack Astors.

\$100 Million cost estimate before tunnel length was increased by 20%. How can it still be \$100 Million?

Western University has stated that no train will run through the University campus. Ever. Yet we are still designing a train tunnel and modifying roads to handle future trains to go to a place that will not accept trains.

Western University prefers the Wharncliffe Western Road route and only gave permission to cut through campus with a few costly but understandable requests.

Initial \$560 Million total BRT estimate has not increased even though we now have to rebuild UWO roads and a bridge and then maintain them forever. Ongoing taxpayer costs to pave and plow UWO should be detailed.

Saul Morrison April 30, 2017